

REMARKS

Status of Claims:

Claims 3, 6, 10, 13, 17, and 25 are cancelled. Thus, claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-9, 11-12, 14-16, 18-24, and 26-30 are present for examination.

Claim Rejection:

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Beck et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,903,723) (hereinafter Beck).

Claims 3, 6, 10, 13, 17, and 25 are cancelled.

With respect to claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-9, 11-12, 14-16, 18-24, and 26-30, as amended, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites an electronic mail transfer device which receives an electronic mail sent from a sending terminal through a communication line and sends at least a portion of the received electronic mail to a receiving terminal through the communication line according to an address of a destination party attached to the electronic mail, comprising:

“means for separating the electronic mail into first data including text data and second data when the received electronic mail includes the second data;

means for storing the second data;

means for inserting an identifier associated with the second data into the first data;

means for sending only the first data with the identifier to the receiving terminal, said identifier permitting for retrieval of the second data by the receiving terminal; and

means for deleting the second data from the means for storing upon receiving a deletion request from the receiving terminal that is a request to delete the second data, and for sending the second data to the receiving terminal upon receiving a reception request from the receiving terminal that is a request to receive the second data.” (Emphasis Added).

An electronic mail transfer device including the above-quoted features has at least the advantages that the electronic mail transfer device includes: (i) means for separating an electronic mail received from a sending terminal into first data including text data and second data when the received electronic mail includes the second data; (ii) means for storing the second data; (iii) means for inserting an identifier associated with the second data into the first data; (iv) means for sending only the first data with the identifier to the receiving terminal, where the identifier permits for retrieval of the second data by the receiving terminal; and (v) **means for deleting the second data** from the means for storing **upon receiving a deletion request** from the **receiving terminal** that is **a request to delete the second data**, and for sending the second data to the receiving terminal upon receiving a reception request from the receiving terminal that is a request to receive the second data. (Specification; page 4, lines 8-11; page 16, lines 12-22; FIGs. 1-3).

Beck neither discloses nor suggests an electronic mail transfer device including the above-quoted features with a **means for deleting second data** from a means for storing **upon receiving a deletion request from a receiving terminal** that is **a request to delete the second data**, and for sending the second data to the receiving terminal upon receiving a reception request from the receiving terminal that is a request to receive the second data.

In the system of Beck, when a recipient PC 212 receives an e-mail primary message 401 with an attached attachment reference 402 from a sending PC 210, the recipient PC 212 may use the attachment reference 402 to access an attachment 420 when desired. (Beck; column 4, line 56 to column 6, line 7). However, the recipient PC 212 in the system of Beck is **not** able to send a request to **delete** the attachment 420. Instead, in the system of Beck, the attachment 420 is either **automatically deleted after being accessed** by the recipient PC 212, or the attachment 420 is **deleted after a given time limit**, such as 90 days. (Beck; column 7, lines 1-18). Therefore, the system of Beck does not include a **means for deleting second data** from a means for storing **upon receiving a deletion request from a receiving terminal** that is **a request to delete the second data**.

Therefore, independent claim 1, as amended, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the Beck reference and, hence, is believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 8 recites an electronic mail transfer system with features similar to features of an electronic mail transfer device of independent claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 8 is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 15 recites an electronic mail transfer method with features similar to features of an electronic mail transfer device of independent claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 15 is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 23 recites an electronic mail transfer device with features similar to features of an electronic mail transfer device of independent claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 23 is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 29 recites an electronic mail transfer device with features similar to features of an electronic mail transfer device of independent claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 29 is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 30 recites an electronic mail transfer method with features similar to features of an electronic mail transfer device of independent claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 30 is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

The dependent claims are deemed allowable for at least the same reasons indicated above with regard to the independent claims from which they depend.

Conclusion:

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-0872. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 50-0872.

If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0872.

Respectfully submitted,

Date August 2, 2006

By Justin M. Sobaje

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (310) 975-7965
Facsimile: (310) 557-8475

Justin M. Sobaje
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 56,252